



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,046	08/29/2000	William T. Geddes Jr.	3503-0101P	8374
30593	7590	02/02/2005	EXAMINER	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195			WONG, LESLIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/650,046	GEDDES JR. ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Leslie Wong	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-137 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-137 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>13 July&amp;Aug. 2004</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed 13 July 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.
2. Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 13 August 2004, has been received, entered into the record, and considered. See attached form PTO-1449.
3. Our record indicates that Applicants have submitted the following information disclosure statements (IDSes) with the OIPE received dates of: 08/13/2004, 07/13/2004, 10/10/2003, 08/27/2003, 06/23/2003, 06/03/2003, 10/03/2002, and 02/20/2002. However, only IDSes with the OIPE received dates of 08/27/2003 and 10/3/2002 were scanned into the electronic system and only four NPL documents were scanned as prior arts submitted by the Applicants: Search report for PCT/US01/25423, article Database Selection and Search Strategy Optimization Information, article Architecture of MetaSearch Engine that Supports User Information Needs, and article About BabyMint. If you feel that the above is incorrect, please resend additional IDSes or NPL documents for scanning in order to make the record complete.

***Withdrawal of Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. Applicants' arguments submitted on 13 July 2004, regarding the 112 rejections, are persuasive. Examiner hereby withdrawn the rejection that was given on the Office Action dated 12 March 2004.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-6, 12, 13, 17, 20-25, 33, 35-38, 40, 41, 44-46, 48, 49, 52-54, 56-57, 60-67, 69-76, 79-137 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sherwin et al. (U.S. 2002/0052784).

Regarding claims 1, 52, 61, 71, and 94-97, **Sherwin** teaches a search method for a computer device, comprising:

- a). associating a user of the computer device with at least one of a plurality of beneficiary groups (¶9); and
- b). providing an arrangement for searching for a provider based upon a search request input to the computer device, the provider being associated with a

beneficiary group associated with the user (¶9).

Regarding claim 2, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the input search request includes a request to search for a provider of one of a good, service and information (¶28).

Regarding claims 3, 64-66, and 72, **Sherwin** further teaches the steps of:

- a). receiving the input search request including a user-specified beneficiary group from the computer device of a user (¶26);
- b). searching for a provider, based upon the search arrangement and the received input search request including the user-specified beneficiary group, the search arrangement including a synergistic concentric circle arrangement (¶s 24 and 26); and
- c). outputting results of the search to the user (¶31).

Regarding claims 4, 23, 48, and 74, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the search arrangement includes an expandable synergistic concentric circle arrangement (¶29).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 24, 25, 49, 75, and 76, **Sherwin** further teaches receiving information from the user for expanding at least one of the synergistic concentric circles of the synergistic expandable concentric circle arrangement (¶28).

Regarding claims 12, 107, and 117, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the step of providing includes providing an arrangement for searching on the Internet (¶31).

Regarding claims 13, 108, 116, and 118, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the step of providing includes providing an arrangement for searching on the worldwide web (¶31).

Regarding claims 17, 33, 40, 41, 56, 57, 69, and 70, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the search priorities include priorities for expanding within an associated beneficiary group or among plural associated beneficiary groups (¶31).

Regarding claims 20, 35, 109, and 119, **Sherwin** further teaches the computer device includes one of a personal computer, personal digital assistant and wireless phone (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 21, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein a synergistic concentric circle is expandable based upon a redefined beneficiary group (¶28).

Regarding claims 22, 104, 105, and 110, **Sherwin** further teaches search method for a computer device, comprising:

- a). receiving, from a computer device, a search request for a provider of a good, service or information and at least one beneficiary group (¶26);

- b). searching for the requested provider, associated with the at least one beneficiary group, based upon the received search request including at least one user-specified beneficiary group (¶s 24 and 26); and
- c). outputting results of the search to the computer device (¶31).

Regarding claim 36, **Sherwin** further teaches a search system, comprising:

- a). a database, adapted to store information associating a user with at least one beneficiary group and information associating a provider with at least one beneficiary group (¶9 and Fig. 2); and
- b). a controller, adapted to receive a search request from a computer device of a user, adapted to search the database based upon the search request and associated beneficiary group of the user, and adapted to eventually provide a search result to the user including a provider associated with the beneficiary group of the user (¶s9, 23 and Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 37, 53, and 62, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the search request includes a search for one of a good, service and information (¶28).

Regarding claims 38, 44, 54, and 60, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the database is searched in expandable synergistic concentric circles formed based upon the search request and associated beneficiary group of the user (¶s 28 and 29).

Regarding claims 45, 111-113 and 120-125, **Sherwin** further teaches computer search method, comprising:

- a). storing information for each of a plurality of users of computer devices and for each of a plurality of providers of at least one of goods, services and information, associating each user and each provider with at least one beneficiary group (¶s 29 and 30);
- b). receiving a search request for at least one of a good, service and information from a computer device of a user (¶ 26);
- c). searching the stored information based upon the search request and the at least one beneficiary group associated with the user (¶s 27 and 31); and
- d). providing a search result to the computer device of the user based upon the search (¶ 31).

Regarding claims 46 and 102-103, **Sherwin** further teaches herein the step of providing includes providing the user with at least one provider of the requested good, service or information, associated with the beneficiary group of the user (¶27).

Regarding claim 63, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the controller is adapted to associate a provider with a user by searching the database (¶31).

Regarding claim 67, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the database is further adapted to store a plurality of users, each associated with at least one beneficiary

group (¶28).

Regarding claim 73, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein a plurality of providers are associated with at least one beneficiary group (¶29).

Regarding claims 79, 82, 85, 88, 91, and 116 **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the output results are displayed to the user (¶31).

Regarding claims 80, 83, 86, 89, and 92, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the display includes addresses of providers (¶30).

Regarding claims 81, 84, 87, 90, 93, and 106, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the addresses include at least one of an Internet address and a physical location address (¶30).

Regarding claims 98-101 and 114-115, **Sherwin** teaches wherein the beneficiary group is an entity and wherein the beneficiary group includes an entity (¶23).

Regarding claims 120-137, **Sherwin** further teaches the association of the user and at least one beneficiary group is pre-designated (¶s 29-31).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 7-11, 14-16, 18, 19, 26-29, 30-32, 34, 39, 42, 43, 47, 50, 51, 55, 58, 59, 68, 77 and, 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sherwin et al.** ("Sherwin") (US 2002/0052784 A1) as applied to claims 1-6, 12, 13, 17, 20-25, 33, 35-38, 40, 41, 44-46, 48, 49, 52-54, 56-57, 60-67, 69-76, 79-137 above in view of **Dunworth et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,930,474).

Regarding claims 7-11, 14-16, 26-29, 30-32, 39, 42, 47, 50, 51, 55, 58, 68, 77 and, 78, **Sherwin** further teaches wherein the step of receiving includes receiving

information expansion of the synergistic concentric circles (¶28).

**Sherwin** does not explicitly teach **priority expansion**.

**Dunworth**, however, teaches **priority expansion** as the database of information is organized into predetermined hierarchy of geographically areas comprising at least a geographical area of relatively small expanse, a geographical area of intermediate expanse, and a geographical area of relatively large expanse (col. 3, lines 46-56; col. 2, lines 42-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Dunworth's** teaching would have allowed **Sherwin's** to allow the user the flexibility to organize the search information according to user's desire in order to meet user's search criteria (col. 2, lines 54-58).

Regarding claims 18, 34, 43, and 59, **Sherwin** does not explicitly teach wherein a synergistic concentric circle is geographically expandable.

**Dunworth**, however, teaches wherein a synergistic concentric circle is geographically expandable and priority expansion (col. 13, lines 8-34; col. 3, lines 46-56; col. 2, lines 42-49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Dunworth's** teaching would have allowed **Sherwin's** to allow the user the flexibility to

organize the search information according to user's desire in order to meet user's search criteria (col. 2, lines 54-58).

Regarding claim 19, Dunworth further teaches wherein a synergistic concentric circle is expandable based priorities including geographic priorities (col. 13, lines 25-34).

#### ***Response to Argument***

9. Applicants' arguments filed 13 July 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the disclosure of Sherwin Publication number U.S. 2002/0052784 and the provisional application are not identical, and thus can not be used as a reference against the present application. First, the provisional application only includes four figures, and thus all aspects of Figure 5, including the description thereof in U.S. 2002/0052784, cannot be used in a rejection against the claims of the present application. The claims of U.S. 2002/0052784 are not present in the provisional application. Also, most of the Summary of the Invention section was also not included in the provisional application, namely paragraphs [0008], [0009], and [0010]. Finally, in paragraph [0026] of U.S. 2002/0052784, the first sentence is not completely supported by the provisional application document. Namely, the first sentence of paragraph [0026] in the provisional application document reads "after logging in... affinity group's behalf".

This sentence obviously does not make sense and was apparently corrected when filing the complete application which as published as U.S. 2002/0052784.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that neither Fig. 5, nor paragraphs reference to Fig. 5, nor claims from U.S. 2002/0052784 were used to reject the claimed limitations of the present invention. Therefore, the arguments regarding Fig. 5 and claims are irrelevant. Paragraph 0009 of U.S. 2002/0052784 Publication Application was used to reject some of the claimed limitations. Although this paragraph is not in the Summary of the Invention section of the provisional application, its content is adequately supported and enabled in the provisional application, see page 10 of the provisional application. Further, the first sentence of paragraph [0026] in the provisional application was not relied upon to reject the limitation as claimed. Hence, the 102(e) rejection is proper: "The U.S. 2002/0052784 Publication Application entitled to the benefit of an earlier filed provisional application because the provisional application adequately supports and enables the subject matter claimed in the nonprovisional application that claims the benefit of the provisional application." See MPEP 2136.03

The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) critical reference date of a U.S. patent or U.S. application publications and certain international application publications entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a provisional application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is the filing date of the provisional application with certain exceptions > if the provisional application(s) properly supports the subject matter relied upon to make the rejection in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph<. See MPEP § 706.02(f)(1), examples 5 to 9.

Applicants argue that U.S 2002/0052784 is directed to an affinity shopping portal, More importantly, the patent is directed to type of “click through” portal system wherein user is encouraged to click through several screens, such that a click-through fee is generated and then is distributed to a number of groups. Accordingly, the goal in U.S 2002/0052784 is to generate click-through fees within a closed network and to encourage a user to shop in a manner which generates click-through and thus click-through fees. This is clearly contrary to the present application as set forth in claim 1, for example, which is directed to a search method: “A search method allows a user to avoid required click-throughs”.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that claim 1 recites:

A search method for a computer device, comprising:

associating a user of the computer device with at least one of a plurality of beneficiary groups;

and

providing an arrangement for searching for a provider based upon a search request input to the computer device, the provider being associated with a beneficiary group associated with the user.

Applicants broadly claim reads on Sherwin’s teaching of each shopper is associated with one of a plurality of affinity groups and forwarding each shopper to a selected one of a plurality of second web-sites (i.e., arrangement for searching) ... it is communicating to each shopper how much was distributed to their associated affinity group on their behalf. Applicants’ arguments regarding the click-through fee and that

the claimed search method allows a user to avoid required click-through are irrelevant as they are not included in the claimed limitations. Thus, Sherwin teaches the limitations as claimed.

Further, Applicants argue that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of U.S. 2002/0052784 Publication Application (Sherwin et al.) with that of Dunworth et al. The Dunworth et al. patent is directed to a searching system which can search information, wherein some of the information can be based on geography. Such an open system, which allows a user to search a large database, has nothing to do with a closed network click-through system. The two systems are completely distinct. Thus it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine their teachings. At best, the Examiner has merely issued broad conclusory statements, which are not evidence of motivation and that the Examiner's opinion is not evidence and as such cannot be used as motivation, teaching or suggestion for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of the prior art references. Somewhat similarly, the examiner cannot rely on any type of design choice or personal knowledge as a reason for combining the teachings of the various references. If the examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support a finding of what is known in the art, the Examiner must provide an Affidavit or Declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanations to support the finding.

In response to applicants' arguments that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Applicants' invention offers a user a fast and efficient way to progressively expand a search for providers of specified search objects including goods, services, or information; while maintaining a desired link to a specified beneficiary group including a particular geographic community, community of interest, or user-preferred class of provider as disclosed in the Applicants' Summary of the Invention section and claim 34 "... synergistic concentric circle is *geographically expandable*". Sherwin teaches buying and selling of goods and services over the Internet for mutual benefit of merchants, affinity groups and consumers (paragraph 0007). Dunworth teaches an Internet searching system which can search information, wherein some of the information can be based on *geography* (Summary of Invention). Dunworth and Sherwin teach related subject matters to applicants' invention. Examiner submits that the combination of Dunworth and Sherwin would have arrived at the Applicants' claimed invention. From MPEP § 2143.01[R-2]:

"There are three possible sources for a motivation to combine references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of

ordinary skill in the art." *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (The combination of the references taught every element of the claimed invention, however without a motivation to combine, a rejection based on a *prima facie* case of obvious was held improper.). The level of skill in the art cannot be relied upon to provide the suggestion to combine references. *AI-Site Corp. v. VSI Int'l Inc.*, 174 F.3d 1308, 50 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

"In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1342-44, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433-34 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (discussing the importance of relying on objective evidence and making specific factual findings with respect to the motivation to combine references); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re*

*Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

*In Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 357 F.3d 1270, 69 USPQ2d 1686 (Fed. Cir. 2004), the patent claimed underpinning a slumping building foundation using a screw anchor attached to the foundation by a metal bracket. One prior art reference taught a screw anchor with a concrete bracket, and a second prior art reference disclosed a pier anchor with a metal bracket. The court found motivation to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention in the "nature of the problem to be solved" because each reference was directed "to precisely the same problem of underpinning slumping foundations." Id. at 1276, 69 USPQ2d at 1690. The court also rejected the notion that "an express written motivation to combine must appear in prior art references...." Id. at 1276, 69 USPQ2d at 1690.

Thus, based on the above, the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art can be used to provide the motivation to combine references.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Leslie Wong  
Primary Examiner

  
Leslie Wong  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

LW  
January 26, 2005